

Improving teaching tools and techniques of teaching graduate engineering courses based on students' learning styles and multiple intelligences

Buket D. Barkana, Navarun Gupta, Lawrence V. Hmurcik
Department of Electrical Engineering
School of Engineering
University of Bridgeport, CT 06604 USA

Abstract:

Our study proposes to improve teaching tools and techniques of teaching graduate engineering courses using students' Learning Styles and Multiple Intelligences (MI). Thirty volunteers answered commercially available Learning Style and MI tests in our Electrical Engineering department. Learning styles are grouped as visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (VAK) and are determined by the VAK learning style test. Learning styles are reflected in different academic strengths, weaknesses, and skills. Studies show that the differences between learning styles will affect both a person's choice of profession and their success in this profession, both in education and in the world of business. People who work at something that fits their learning style have a better chance of becoming successful in it.

1. Introduction:

Institutions of higher education are always looking for ways to improve their educational initiatives. In colleges and universities, teaching is a very important way to achieve institutional goals of increased effectiveness and the improvement of student learning. The inability to consciously control and manage the learning process in higher education in general and various classes in particular lies in a lack of understanding of the learning process itself, and this can serve as a substantial impediment to student learning and faculty teaching [1]. Instructors need to do more in utilizing accepted learning theories, principles, and teaching technology that will improve learning and assist students in developing themselves to their full potential. Researchers continually discuss ways to reform a university's teaching. While some of them focus on the learning styles of the students [2,3,4,5], others focus on the requirements for re-examination of fundamental assumptions about how universities function and consideration of empirical research about how students learn [6].

We offer effective teaching tools for different learning styles of engineering graduate students. If we teach exclusively in the students' preferred mode, the students may not develop the mental dexterity they need to reach their potential for achievement in school and as professionals. On the other hand, if we teach exclusively in a manner that favors the students' less preferred learning style modes, the students' discomfort level may be great enough to interfere with their learning. In 1990, Tobias pointed out two *tiers* of entering college students. The first tier goes on to earn science degrees and the second tier has the initial intention and the ability to do so but instead switches to nonscientific fields. The number of students in the second tier might in fact be a result of the teaching techniques that are used in engineering education [7].

Which teaching techniques should we use in the engineering classroom to engage more students? This is *the question* we need to answer. We focus on the students' learning styles and multiple intelligences to answer *this question*.

Thirty volunteers answered MI and VAK tests in our Electrical Engineering department. The MI test includes 40 questions, and the VAK test includes 30 questions, each designed to find our graduate students' strongest thinking and learning preferences. Subjects were the engineering graduate students in ELEG 443-Digital Signal Processing. The MI test was used for finding the thinking styles, and the VAK test was used for finding the learning styles. Thinking and learning styles show individual differences in academic performance that are related not to abilities but rather how people prefer to use their abilities [8].

Our MI test results show that 62% of graduate engineering students have strong visual/spatial intelligence, 19% have strong linguistic intelligence, and 19% have strong kinesthetic intelligence. Logical-Mathematical intelligence is the strongest for only 23% of the students who took the MI test. According to the VAK learning styles test, 50% prefer the auditory learning style, 35% prefer the visual/spatial learning style, and 15% prefer the kinesthetic learning style.

Figure 1: MI and VAK test profiles of the students in the ELEG 443-Digital Signal Processing course at the University of Bridgeport, Spring 2008.

MI and VAK test results agree with each other when stating the preference for the kinesthetic learning style. They disagree when evaluating linguistic and visual preferences. See Figure 1. Results show that female students have a stronger linguistic intelligence than male students. From this, we propose several teaching tools and techniques to improve the students' performance in engineering courses that are strongly based on theory such as Digital signal processing, Speech signal processing, Bio-medical signal processing, and the other courses. Teaching tools and techniques are aimed to address different learning styles and MI in the classroom.

Two main learning styles among our engineering graduate students are the Auditory learning style (19%-50%) and the Visual/spatial learning style (62%-35%). There are basic distinctions between these two learning styles. While auditory learners think primarily in words, have auditory strengths, relate well in time, learn by trial and error, follows oral directions well, can show steps of work easily, and develop fairly evenly, visual/spatial learners think primarily in pictures, have visual strengths, relate well to space, learn complex concepts easily, struggles with easy skills, arrive at correct solutions intuitively, and develop asynchronously [9].

In engineering education, there are two types of courses: theoretical and experimental. Theoretical courses are usually held in the classroom. All the students sit and listen to the instructor. Experimental courses are usually held in the laboratory, and students can move around freely. Theoretical courses are predominantly an auditory environment in which the curriculum, textbooks, teaching methods, and the teachers themselves are sequential. The over-reliance on auditory-sequential methods in these courses works against the visual-spatial learner. Laboratory courses are predominantly a kinesthetic environment. The students who are visual-spatial learner face disadvantages in mastering material in the normal classroom setting where standard classroom techniques are used. Before presenting some teaching techniques for different thinking and learning styles, let us take a brief look into learning styles and MI in education.

2. Learning Styles

Learning style is defined as a manner in which different elements from five basic stimuli affect a person's ability to perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment (Dunn & Dunn [10]). Answering all or most of the learning style elements that are environmental, emotional, sociological, physical, and psychological stimulus in the classroom can provide an effective learning environment for all students with different learning styles.

Emotional stimulus: high versus low need for structure

Sociological stimulus: group versus individual sociological preferences

Physical stimulus: perceptual strengths such as auditory, visual, and kinesthetic

Psychological stimulus: global versus analytic, high versus low level of motivation [11].

The VAK test classifies learning styles into three groups: Auditory, visual, and kinesthetic. Auditory learners learn best when information is presented in an auditory language format. They seem to learn best in classes that emphasize teacher lectures and class discussions. Listening to audio tapes helps them to learn better. They read aloud or talk things out to gain better understanding. This type of learner does very well in traditional classes [12]. See Table I.

Table I.

STIMULUS		TEACHING APPROACH
Emotional stimulus	High need for structure	Presenting the expected outcomes
	Low need for structure	Open-ended approaches
Sociological stimulus	Group preferences	Group activities, team work.
	Individual preferences	Self-sufficient, individual work.
Physical stimulus	Perceptual strengths (auditory, visual, kinesthetic)	Preferences of the auditory, visual, and kinesthetic strengths are given below.
Psychological stimulus	Global processors	Visual techniques. Holistic, visual-spatial, metaphoric.
	Analytical processors	Verbal techniques. Logical, sequential, verbal.

Visual learners have two sub-channels: *linguistic* and *spatial*. *Visual-linguistic* learners like to learn through written language, such as reading and writing tasks. They remember what has been written down, even if they do not read it more than once. They like to write down directions and pay better attention to lectures if they watch them. Learners who are *visual-spatial* usually have difficulty with written language and do better with charts, demonstrations, videos, and other visual materials. They do extraordinarily well with tasks that have spatial components: solving puzzles, tracing mazes, duplicating block designs, counting three-dimensional arrays of blocks, visual transformations, and mental rotations. Spatial abilities underlie both mathematical talent and creativity, and are essential in a number of fields: mathematics, science, computer science, technological fields, architecture, mechanics, aeronautics, engineering, and most creative endeavors (visual arts, music, etc.). The advantages of this learning style include: perceiving the whole quickly, finding patterns easily, thinking graphically, and understanding dimensionality [13-14]. These people may experience difficulty with verbal instructions, with sequential problem solving, and with drill and practice. An image is not improved through drill and practice. We can improve their learning while offering the right teaching method for them.

Kinesthetic learners do best while touching and moving. It also has two sub channels - kinesthetic (movement) and tactile (touch). They tend to lose concentration if there is little or no external stimulation or movement. When listening to lectures they may want to take notes. When reading, they like to scan the material first, and then focus in on the details (get the big picture first). They typically use color highlighters and take notes by drawing pictures, diagrams, or doodling. To integrate these three learning styles into the learning environment, we need to use various teaching techniques in our classroom.

3. Multiple Intelligences:

MI theory was developed by Dr. Howard Gardner. The multiple intelligence theory denotes seven-eleven distinct units of intellectual functioning in a human being [15]. These units are separate intelligences with their own observable and measurable abilities. Multiple Intelligences are grouped as naturalistic, kinesthetic, linguistic, logical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, musical, and visual/spatial. The theory of multiple intelligences suggests several other ways in which the material might be presented to facilitate effective learning. It provides eight different potential pathways to learning. If an instructor is having difficulty reaching a student in the more traditional linguistic or logical ways of instruction, the theory of multiple intelligences gives several other ways in which the material might be presented to facilitate effective learning. These are:

1. Words (linguistic intelligence)
2. Numbers or logic (logical-mathematical intelligence)
3. Pictures (spatial intelligence)
4. Music (musical intelligence)
5. Self-reflection (intrapersonal intelligence)
6. A physical experience (bodily-kinesthetic intelligence)
7. A social experience (interpersonal intelligence)
8. and/or, an experience in the natural world (naturalist intelligence)

MI theory suggests that faculty think about a repertoire of approaches that tap into the various intelligences instead of only one approach [16]. MI theory might provide the intrinsic motivation for faculty to alter their approach to teaching because this theory is based on a realization that students have different intelligences. Most faculty and administrators believe in the need to develop people to meet their potential. This theory has been tested in hundreds of studies over the last twenty years, indicating that students' learning is enhanced by multiple intelligence instruction [17-19]

4. Teaching Methods

Effective teaching in all fields requires flexibility and energy. Engineering education is no exception. It is important to create an optimal teaching– learning environment by utilizing a variety of teaching methods and teaching styles. If instructors use a variety of teaching methods and styles, students are exposed to both familiar and unfamiliar ways of learning that provide both comfort and tension during the process, ultimately giving students multiple ways to excel.

- **Showing the Application Areas of the Topics**

During the last one and a half decades, we have seen some very large technological developments. Areas based on signal processing theory/applications have become one of the most focused and desirable areas of engineering. Many theories, methods, and algorithms which were rarely used in the past have now found applications. Signal processing courses usually contain many equations and definitions. Although some students who have auditory, spatial learning style and logical-mathematical intelligence prefer to study using equations and definitions, some students with visual and kinesthetic learning styles do not prefer it. However, all learning style students would like to see the “big picture” before going deeply into the minute details. To show the application areas

of the topic is a great way to engage students in the class before introducing the theory required to make these applications work.

One of us (Barkana) teaches ELEG 454-Speech Signal Processing and ELEG 457-Speech Coding Courses at the University of Bridgeport, CT. These are heavy in theory.

Fortunately, there are many areas of application: Speech Recognition, Speaker Verification/ Identification, Text-to-Speech, Speech Synthesis, and Speech Coding.

Classes start with a presentation of a recent technological development; the theory comes later. Many companies have demos of their products on the Web: AT&T -- speech synthesis, Qualcomm Inc. -- speech coding methods, Dragon Naturally Speaking -- speech recognition, etc. Students ask "How did they do it?", after they view the video demos.

This is a sign that students are interested in what is going on in the classroom, and they are willing to learn no matter what teaching method is offered.

- **Integrating the old and new knowledge**

A logical extension of the view that new knowledge must be constructed from existing knowledge is that teachers need to pay attention to incomplete understandings, false beliefs, and naive renditions of concepts that learners bring to a given subject. Like *Fish Is Fish*, everything the people heard was incorporated into that pre-existing view:

Fish Is Fish describes a fish who is keenly interested in learning about what happens on land, but the fish cannot explore land because it can only breathe in water. It befriends a tadpole who grows into a frog and eventually goes out onto the land. The frog returns to the pond a few weeks later and reports on what he has seen. The frog describes all kinds of things like birds, cows, and people. The book shows pictures of the fish's representations of each of these descriptions: each is a fish-like form that is slightly adapted to accommodate the frog's descriptions—people are imagined to be fish who walk on their tailfins, birds are fish with wings, cows are fish with udders. [Lionni, 1970]

This tale illustrates both the creative opportunities and dangers inherent in the fact that people construct new knowledge based on their current knowledge. Students integrate their previous knowledge with the new one presented to them. Instructors need to build on these ideas in ways that help each student achieve a more mature understanding. If students' initial ideas and beliefs are ignored, the understandings that they develop can be very different from what the instructor intends. There is a good deal of evidence that learning is enhanced when instructors pay attention to the knowledge and beliefs that learners bring to a learning task and use this knowledge as a starting point for new instruction [20].

Students would like to see a connection between the old and new knowledge.

Visual/spatial learners can see this connection much faster while the other learners have a difficult time connecting the old and new knowledge without any help. It is the instructor's job to evaluate students' current knowledge before introducing new knowledge. As an example, before introducing the Modified Discrete Cosine Transform in Speech Coding, students are tested on their old knowledge, i.e. about what they learned about Discrete Cosine Transforms in Digital Signal Processing. It takes less than ten minutes of class discussion to find out a great deal of information on the students' old knowledge of this topic. We not only build a bridge between old and new, but also we

give students a chance to talk about it, and thus Linguistic intelligence and the auditory learning style are addressed with this teaching technique.

- **Technology use in the classroom**

The traditional classroom structure is no longer enough for good engineering education. We must use the many technological tools available. Students can learn theory better and faster when they have the opportunity to apply it. Multimedia tools include the use of text, graphics, sounds, and video. They form a dynamic environment that allows supplemental information to be immediately available to the learner, depending on the type of lesson structure.

The goal is to enable the instructor and students to take full advantage of the technology options that are available to them. The potential for using technology in teaching provides new opportunities for higher education to meet the students' needs. Students have their own notebook or personal telecommunications system with Web access; such devices (such as portable WI-FI notebooks) are no longer expensive to today's student. Most universities, including ours, have wireless internet access in their buildings. Linking Web resources and multimedia tools provide search engines, e-books, e-journals, digital academic videos, text, graphics, and sound to each student. Davidson says that one of the distinct features of multimedia is to be able to modify the structure of the lesson by allowing learners to have various levels of control over the pace and pathways through the lesson [21]. Students easily access supplemental information related to the subject taught in class. This activity will engage students who have visual and kinesthetic learning styles. Using programming languages and tools will, in turn, develop a student's thinking skills and also give them the opportunity to do simulation of the theory. The Signal Processing Toolbox in MATLAB is one of the most used and well known tools in engineering fields. Using MATLAB in teaching courses in signal processing enables the student to not only develop a better understanding of the subject, but also it builds their overall programming skills. (Another software in the same subject area is COLEA.)

- **Presenting the Theory**

Although there are many studies [22,23,24] about presenting theoretical information to the students with different learning styles, it is impossible to formulate exact teaching methods for theoretical courses. During the presentation of the theory, it is important to offer technical definitions in *verbal or textual statements* for the students with auditory learning style and linguistic intelligence, *mathematical or analytical models, formulas, equations, flow charts, and algorithms* for the students with logical-mathematical intelligence, *graphical representations, pictures, simulations, numbers and the outline of the subject* for visual/spatial learners. The traditional classroom environment is not appropriate for the kinesthetic learner. Offering a laboratory course corresponding to each theory course at the same time will provide a learning environment for this type of learner.

- **Offering a Lab course for each theory course**

Many benefits for offering a laboratory course in engineering education have been reported. Laboratory courses are vital for engineering education. As a Signal Processing Group, we have established a Digital Signal Processing Laboratory course and an Audio Signal Processing Laboratory course to enhance the material and concepts covered in DSP, Speech Signal Processing, Speech Coding, and Multimedia Signal Processing courses at the University of Bridgeport. Hands-on real-time experiments are based on the TMS320C6713, TMS320C5510 DSK, and MATLAB. Since the theory of the signal processing courses includes many symbols, formulations, and theorems, instructors have difficulty engaging students with a kinesthetic learning style. The following statements are given by the students who take the laboratory courses as well as the theoretical courses:

Student 1 → I finally see what is going on.

Student 2 → I could never figure out where the signal came from or went to...now I see the picture clearly.

By taking a lab, our students gain research experience, industrial experience, MATLAB programming skills, real-time DSP designing and implementation skills on their projects, writing skills, and teamwork.

- **Project based learning (PBL)**

Project-based learning is an educational process through which knowledge, principles and practices can be developed. Project-based learning is particularly pertinent in engineering education as the majority of professional engineering work is conducted through group projects. Therefore, it is logical to integrate project-based learning into undergraduate engineering education, alongside traditional, classroom-style coursework. Project-based learning offers an engaging means of education for students in engineering courses. Traditional coursework consists of a large amount of engineering theory followed by a series of assignments, papers or examinations in order to assess the students understanding of the theoretical material. Project-based learning offers a medium through which students can apply this engineering knowledge in a real world project, in order to meet a real and practical project objective. Through this means the students are able to directly create the link between theoretical knowledge and the solution to a practical problem [25].

Both men and women benefit from working in small groups, hands-on activities, and interdisciplinary teaching. Projects with "real world" connections enhance the effect of working in small groups, interdisciplinary teaching and hands-on activities with regard to student interest and participation in engineering [26,27]. Collaborative learning and working in groups to develop knowledge collectively has the potential to develop interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences. Communications skills and management concepts are developed through team activity, and written and oral presentation of project progress reports. Library skills are developed through lectures, 'hands-on' tutorials, and

exercises. The ability to search for and find information is essential to the project based learning approach, and it will be valuable throughout the engineering course [28].

PBL allows students work individually or collaboratively to construct their knowledge. It provides learners with an interpersonal intelligence and kinesthetic learning style to organize their ideas and their own learning experiences. PBL is crucial for courses based on signal processing because of the large amount of deep theoretical concepts. Instructors should organize the course and its grading system, including oral presentations, individual and group projects, simulation assignments.

- **Guest lecturers, linked courses/disciplines**

A guest lecturer is external authority who may make a presentation to the class, while the instructor remains responsible for arranging this and subsequent lectures. The instructor acting in unison with the guest lecturer will account for the success of the guest's class [29]. Guest lecturers give students the chance to meet people from industry: engineers, scientists, and researchers. The knowledge that the lecturer imparts comes from years of experience and gives students valuable insights into both industry and academia. At our school, the School of Engineering organizes 8 colloquia every semester to bring in guest speakers with unique expertise. Students see a guest lecturer as a role model while learning the application areas of the theory they have learned in the classroom.

Faculty engage in joint curriculum planning so as to help students understand connections between courses and disciplines. Students will have opportunities for deeper understanding of and integration of the material they are learning, and more interaction with one another and their teachers as fellow participants in the learning enterprise [30].

- **Recalling Lecture (RL) after every four-week of lecture**

In Engineering courses, students need to discuss and question the subject in order to simulate a professional approach. Yet learning to speak like a professional in a strong academic context may be difficult because the student requires first a strong technical vocabulary with long, complex definitions. This is twice as hard for students who take Engineering courses taught in English, when their mother tongue is not English. Using RL activity, this problem can be solved. For theory classes, we have an RL after four-weeks of standard lectures. All students are encouraged to talk professionally about the previous topics they have learned. Students with auditory learning style enjoy this activity very much. In addition, it helps students to see and memorize the topics in toto. Rewarding students who attend and contribute to the RL gives self-confidence and a feeling of achievement. One reward may be an extra homework grade to offset some of their previous lower grades. Also, some students do not want to talk in public (classroom). Debate activity is the answer to motivate and engage this type of learning style. They can contribute to their team by research, writing, or preparing a presentation instead of talking in public.

Conclusion:

Teaching tools and techniques are presented for the teaching of graduate courses in engineering education. These are used at the University of Bridgeport. They are based on students' learning styles and multiple intelligences. Students take in and process information in different ways such as seeing and hearing, reflecting and acting, reasoning logically and intuitively, analyzing and visualizing, steadily and in fits and starts. Instructors' teaching methods also vary. Some instructors lecture, others demonstrate or lead students to self-discovery; some focus on principles and others on applications; some emphasize memory and others understanding. Theoretical and laboratory courses require different skills. It is important to address all learning styles and the MIs during the teaching process.

We conclude strongly that independent of styles, it is a tremendous benefit for any theoretical course in engineering to have as its complement another lab based course addressing the same material. Not only is this of value for the signal processing courses cited here, but also we use this approach for courses in Controls, PLC (Programmable Logic controls), Analog Electronics design, Digital Electronics design, Fiber Optics, and Analog/Digital communications.

Other findings include the use of assigning projects (instead of just determining a student's grade from an exam). Also, group projects offer a dynamic that can often be better than that produced by assigning individual projects.

Our final conclusion is the reaffirmation of using both old and new tools to enhance the classroom experience. Old tools include bringing in a guest lecturer or having student presentations. New tools include the multimedia audio/video/wi-fi/portable computer/etc. tools that are now cheap and prevalent.

References:

- [1] [Sims R.R., Sims S. J., "The importance of Learning Styles, Understanding the Implications for learning", Course design, and Education, ISBN 0-313-29278-7, 1995, Greenwood Press].
- [2][R.M. Felder, L.K. Silverman, "Learning and Teaching Styles in Engineering Education", Engineering Education, 78(7), 674-681 (1988).
- [3] R.S. Dunn, S.A. Griggs, Multiculturalism and Learning Style: Teaching and Counselling Adolescents, Westport, CT:Praeger, 1995.
- [4]Reid G., Learning Styles and Inclusion, 2005.
- [5]R.A. Rochford, "Assessing Learning Styles to improve the quality of performance of community college students in developmental writing programs: A pilot study", Community College Journal of Research and Practice, Vol.27, Number 8, pp.665-677, 03.],
- [6][Rob Phillips, "Challenging The Primacy of Lectures: The Dissonance Between Theory and Practice in University Teaching", journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, Volume 2, Issue 1, 2005].
- [7][Tobias, Sheila. They're Not Dumb, They're Different: Stalking the Second Tier. Research Corporation, Tucson, 1990].

- [8][Zhang L., Sternberg R.J., Are Learning Approaches and Thinking Styles Related? A Study in Two Chinese Populations, *The Journal of Psychology*, 2000, 134 (5), 469-489].
- [9] [Linda Kreger Silverman. Ph.D., "The visual-Spatial Learner: An Introduction"., Soundview School Dolphin News, pp.6-7, 2003].
- [10][Dunn, R.,& Dunn, K. (1978), *Teaching students through their individual learning styles.*, Reston, VA, Reston Publishing Company].
- [11] [Griggs, S.A. (1983), *Counseling high school students for their individual learning styles*, Clearing House, 56, 293-296.]
- [12][R.M. Felder, L.K. Silverman, "Learning and Teaching Styles in Engineering Education", *Engineering Education*, 78(7), 674-681 (1988).]
- [13][Linda Silverman, Ph.D., "Effective Techniques for Teaching Highly Gifted Visual-Spatial Learners", The Institute for the Study of Advanced Development, <http://www.gifteddevelopment.com/Articles/vsl/v05.pdf>
- [14] Linda Kreger Silverman, "Upside-down Brilliance: The visual-spatial learner", Queensland Association for Gifted and Talented Children, 2005].
- [15] [Howard Gardner, Thomas Hatch, *Educational Implications of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 18, No. 8, 4-10 (1989)]
- [16][Adrianna Kezar, *Theory of Multiple Intelligences: Implications for Higher Education*, *Innovative Higher Education*, Vol. 26, No. 2, Winter 2001]
- [17] Pınar Özdemir, Sibel Güneysu and Ceren Tekkaya, *Enhancing learning through multiple intelligences*, *Educational Research*, Vol.40, No.2, p74-78, 5p, Spring 2006],
- [18] [Kallenbach, S., & Viens, J. (2002). *Open to interpretation: Multiple intelligences theory in adult literacy education* (NSCALL Report 21). Cambridge, MA: National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy],
- [19] Shore, Jane R.. *Teacher Education and Multiple Intelligences: A Case Study of Multiple Intelligences and Teacher Efficacy in Two Teacher Preparation Courses* *Teachers College Record*, Jan2004, Vol. 106 Issue 1, p112-139, 28p].
- [20](How People Learn **Brain, Mind, Experience, and School** John D. Bransford, Ann L. Brown, and Rodney R. Cocking, editors Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, NATIONAL ACADEMY PRESS, Washington, D.C., 1999)
- [21] [Davidson-shivers, Gayle V., Nowlin, Barry; Lanouette, Michael, *Do Multimedia Lesson Structure and Learning Styles influence undergraduate writing performance*, *College Student Journal*, March2002, vol.36, issue 1, p20,12p.].
- [22] Richard M. Felder, Donald R. Woods, James E. Stice, Armando Rugarcia, *THE FUTURE OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION II. TEACHING METHODS THAT WORK*, *Chem. Engr. Education*, 34(1), 26–39 (2000)],
- [23] [Perrenet J. C.; Bouhuijs P. A. J.; Smits J. G. M. M., *The Suitability of Problem-based Learning for Engineering Education: theory and practice* , *Teaching in Higher Education*, Volume 5, Number 3, 1 July 2000 , pp. 345-358(14)],
- [24] CL Dym, AM Agogino, O Eris, DD Frey, LJ Leifer - *Engineering Design Thinking, Teaching, and Learning*, *IEEE ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT REVIEW*, 2006]
- [25](Project-Based Learning: A Search and Rescue UAV – Perceptions of an Undergraduate Engineering Design Team: A Preliminary Study, Benjamin J. Chartier, Brad A. Gibson, *Proceedings of the 2007 AaeE Conference*, Melbourne, 2007)

[26](Women in Engineering: Exploring the Effects of Project-Based Learning in a First-Year Undergraduate Engineering Program, Zastavker, Y.V.; Ong, M.; Page, L. *Frontiers in Education Conference*, 36th Annual, Volume , Issue , 27-31 Oct. 2006 Page(s):1 – 6),
[27] (Li-Ling, C., Cooperative project-based learning and students' learning styles on web page development, *J. Educational Technology Systems*, 32(4), 363-375)

[28](Project-Based Learning in Engineering Education: an approach used by Monash University Malaysia, Teoh Kok-Soo, *International Conference on Engineering Education* July 21–25, 2003, Valencia, Spain)

[29] Helen Spafford Jacob, Robyn Honey, Catherine Jordan, Getting the most out of sequential teaching, *Teaching and Learning Forum 2002: Focusing on the Student*

[30] A. Williams. Learning Communities: An Overview. *Invention: Creative Thinking about Learning and Teaching*, 2 (2), Fall 2000.

<<http://www.doit.gmu.edu/Archives/fall00/awilliams.htm>>.